

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 59, 61-66, 68-73, 75-79, 81 and 83-88 are pending in the application, with claims 59, 66, 73, 81, and 83 being the independent claims. Claims 59, 66, 73, 81, and 83 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 59, 61-66, 68-73, 75-79, 81, and 83

The Examiner has issued an Advisory Action dated May 17, 2011 in which the rejection of independent claims 59, 66, 73, 81, and 83 (as well as their dependent claims) was maintained under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,956,683 to Jacobs et al. ("Jacobs") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,929,748 to Odinak ("Odinak"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 59 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the data comprises audio data generated to be consistent with audio data generated by the device based on a type of the device." Support for this amendment is found, *inter alia*, at paragraph [0084] of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0072918 ("Published Specification").

As noted at paragraph [0084] of the Published Specification, it is desirable for voice output provided by the local device (e.g., lightweight speech recognition results

handled entirely at the local device) to have a consistent, “seamless” feel to voice output provided by the remote device. Moreover, “multiple instances of VUI 62 may be provided such that a different VUI is used based on the type of local device 14,” in accordance with a non-limiting example, as further recited at paragraph [0084] of the Published Specification.

Jacobs and Odinak fail to teach or suggest any manner of consistency between “audio data” generated by, e.g., a remote device, and, in the case of a local device “audio data generated by the device.” Moreover, any such consistency would therefore also not be “based on a type of the device.”

For at least the aforementioned reasons, claim 59 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Jacobs and Odinak. Claims 66, 73, 81, and 83 recite similar features to those discussed above, using respective language, and are likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Jacobs and Odinak for at least the same reasons as claim 59, and further in view of their own respective features. The various dependent claims each depend from one of claims 59, 66, 73, 81, and 83, and are likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Jacobs and Odinak for at least the same reasons as claims 59, 66, 73, 81, and 83, and further in view of their own respective features.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 59, 61-66, 68-73, 75-79, 81, and 83 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 84-88

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 84-88 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Jacobs in view of Odinak, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,658 to Miyazawa et al. (“Miyazawa”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

For the reasons noted above, claims 59, 66, 73, 81, and 83 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Jacobs and Odinak. Miyazawa does not provide the missing teaching or suggestion, nor does the Examiner rely on Miyazawa as allegedly supplying the missing teaching or suggestion. Accordingly, claims 59, 66, 73, 81, and 83 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Jacobs, Odinak, and Miyazawa. Claims 84, 85, 86, 87, and 88 depend from claims 59, 66, 73, 81, and 83, respectively, and are likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Jacobs, Odinak, and Miyazawa for at least the same reasons as claims 59, 66, 73, 81, and 83, and further in view of their own respective features.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 84-88 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully
requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Salvador M. Bezos
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 60,889

Date: 8 June 2011

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600